Sectt. II-27—60,004—17-11-48.

Education and Public Health **(1949) Department.**

Ms. **SERIES.**

G.O. NO. 2285 P.H.

Date 24-6-1949.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Workmen's Compensation Act-South Kanara-Puthur taluk-Jalroor village-Well work-Accident to one Pakrunhi beary-Payment of compensation-Sanction

Revenue Department,
Subject:-
Workmen's compensation Act - South Kanara - Puthur taluk - Jalroor village - well work - Accident to one Pakrunhi beary - payment of compensation - sanction of - report called for - instructions - issued.

Ref.V.1343/49-2

Station: Madras.
Dated: 27-5-1949.
From

N.C. Thomas Esq., B.A.,
Joint Secretary, Board of Revenue, Madras.

W. R. S. Sattianathan Esq., I.C.S., Commissioner of Land Revenue and Commercial Taxes.

Read:- From the Collector, South Kanara Ref.C.No.6122/47-B3 d/ 12-3-49.

Reference:-

ASSISTANT SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
31 MAY 1949

Submitted to Government.

41596

2. In the circumstances reported by the Collector, the Board recommends that the Government may be pleased to accord sanction payment of a Sum of Rs 720 to the widow of the deceased being the compensation, awarded by the Commissioner of Labour.

A

The Accountant General is ebing requested to report to Government direct the correct head of account to which the expenditure is debitable. As the Commissioner of Labour is pressing the Board for very early disbursement of the amount it requests very early orders.

** ** **

FOR JOINT SECRETARY.

To
The Secretary to Government, E & P.H. Dept. (Paras 1 & 2 only with a copy of the Collector's letter.)
The Accountant General, Madras T7. (Para 3 only with a copy of the Collector's letter.
The Collector of South Kanara (Paras 4 & 5 only).
The Collectors of all districts except Madras and South Kanara (Para 5 only).

~~CA/29.5.~~

CA/28.5.
3V

Copy of letter No.C.No.6122/47.B3 dated 12-3-1949 from the Collector of South Kanara.

Sub:- Workmen's Compensation Act - South Kanara District - Puttur Taluk Jalsoor village - well work Accident to one Pakrunhi beary - Payment of compensation - Report - Copy submitted.

Ref:- Board's Ref.V.No.1343/49-1 dated 5-3-1949.

A copy of this office report Ref: C.No.6112/47-B3 dated 19-1-1949, and copies of the enclosures mentioned in the report, are enclosed.

Yours faithfully,

sd. xx xx
For Collector.

Copy of this office letter Ref: C.No.6122/47-B3 dated 19-1-1949 addressed to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue and Commercial Taxes, Madras.

Sub:- Workmen's Compensation Act: South Kanara District Puttur Taluk - Jalsoor village - well Work - Accident to one Pakrunhi Beary - Payment of compensation - report submitted.

Under the Rural Water Supply Scheme as sanctioned in G.O. No.Ms. 23127 P.H. dated 15-7-1940 (Ten years programme) a well work in Jalsoor village, of Puttur Taluk South Kanara District was entructed to the Highways Department for execution. The work, was to be paid by the Collector from the Government Funds, on the certificate given by that Department. The Highways Department appointed a contractor, one K. Narayana Rai of Puttur for the execution of the work. The contractor is said to be not a registered contractor but work was entrusted to him on the recommendation of the Tahsildar Puttur. The contractor is reported to have no other work, in this division. No security deposit was obtained from him by the Highways, Department.

One Pakrunhi Beary a cooly was one of the persons employed for the well work by the contractor Narayana Rai. This cooly met with an accident while sinking the well on 14-6-1946, and died on 18-6-1946. He was aged about 55 years, and was a casual labourer and not a cooly permanently working under the contractor. The contractor had not completed the work. He had only done, some portion of the work for which a bill for Rs.211/- was sent by the Contractor. This amount has been drawn, but not paid to him (contractor). It is kept in Revenue Deposit in the district Treasury.

Isamma Bearthi the widow of the deceased seaman, Pakrunhi Beary, filed an application before the Commissioner for workmen's compensation, Madras, claiming compensation from the Collector of South Kanara, under the Workmen's compensation Act. The Commissioner, for workmen's Compensation, Madras, has fixed the compensation as Rs.720/Rs on the monthly average pay of Rs.22-8-0, and on the fact that the deceased colly was appointed only for one day on 14-6-1946, the day on which he met with the fatal accident. The Commissioner has called upon the Collector to deposit this amount of compensation (Rs.720/-) after collecting it from the Contractor, Sri Narayana Rai S/o Thimmappa Rai of Jalsur village, P.O. Sullia. The Collector called upon the Contractor, to pay the sum. The Contractor disclaimed responsibility, contending that the calamity occurred owing to the deceased's own negligence and carelessness. He also refused to pay the amount.

The Contractor, was not a registered Contractor. No security deposit, was also taken from him by the Highways Department, before the work was entrusted. He is said to have no personal properties. He is a member of a family governed by the Aliyasanthana law of succession and persess, some right in the joint family property. It was not therefore, possible to recover the dues from him, in the ordinary way.

The Collector, therefore, filed an application before the Commissioner for Workmen's compensation, Madras, under Sec.12(2) and Rule 39 of the Workmen's compensation Act., and prayed to pass an award against the contractor fo the said amount, and also for the costs of the petitioner (Collector). The

Commissioner for Workmen's compensation, Madras, in turn, held enquiry into the case, and has passed a judgement. In the Judgment, it has been decided that the applicant Isamma Bearthi (widow of the deceased Pakrunhi Beary) is entitled to be paid a sum of Rs.720/- as compensation, and the Collector who is the opposite party, is entitled to be indemnified in a sum of Rs.720/- by the contractor (D.W.1). The Contractor has also been directed to pay Rs.3/Re- towards Court fees label affixed in the application.

Further, the Commissioner, calls upon the Collector to deposit with him the compensation amount of Rs.720/- awarded to the applicant, at the same time, the Collector has also been advised to call upon the contractor to deposit with him (Collector) the amount of (Rs.723/-) awarded in favour of the Collector and to apply to the Commissioner for recovery of the amount from him (Contractor) under section 31 of the Workmen's compensation Act if he fails to deposit the amount. The Commissioner, has, however, stated that the deposit to be made by the Collector should not be held over, till the recovery of the amount from the contractor.

The Collector is taking further action to realise the sum from the contractor, and will report the result in due course, In the meanwhile, the sum of Rs.720/- awarded to the applicant, (widow of the deceased) will have to be deposited with the Commissioner, as pointed out by him. Arrangements may kindly be made to do this, or the sum required may be placed at the disposal of the Collector.

A copy of the original letter and enclosure received from the Commissioner for Workmen's compensation, Madras, a copy of the judgement passed in the case, and a copy of the final letter, received from the Commissioner, are enclosed.

(sd) xx xx
FOR COLLECTOR.

Copy of letter C.1.4556/46 dated 18th June 1947, from the Commissioner for workmen's Compensation, Madras to the Collector of South Kanara, Mangalore.

Sub:- Workman's Compensation -Fatal accident to Pokruthi Bearing - Cooly payment of compensation.

It is reported that one Pakrunhi Beary, Cooly, met with an accident on 14-6-46 while sinking a well at Jalsur under the Rural Water Supply Scheme and died on 18-6-1946. The Divisional Engineer (Highways) Mangalore, reports that the work in which the deceased cooly was engaged is entirely a Government work and financed from Government funds and payments made by the Collector. I enclose copy of letter No.661-D.1/47HR dated 4-6-1947 received from the Chief Engineer (Highways) Madras, together with the enclosures referred to therein. Please ask the contractor K.Narayana Rao S/o Thimmappa Rao Kunje of Jalsur village, Post Subha to fill in the enclosed forms and to send them along with the compensation of Rs.720/- at an early date.

C.G. Reddi,
Commissioner for Workmen's Compensation.

Copy of letter No.661-D.1./47 dated 4-5-47 from the Chief Enginner (Highways) Madras.

Sub:- Workman's compensation - fatal accident to cooly, Pakrunhi Beary payment of compensation.

Ref:- From the S.E.(B) V Circle Coimbatore No.905. CE dated 27-5-47.

With reference to correspondence resting with your letter No.4556/46 dated 21-3-1947, I enclose a copy of the Superintending Engineer's letter referred to above together with the two forms duly filled in.

In the circumstances mentioned by the SuperintendingEngineer these forms may be transmitted to the Collector of South Kanara District for signature as the employer, and further correspondence regarding payment of the balance may be had with the Collector South Kanara.

(sd) For Chief Engineer (Highways).

Copy to the Superintending Engineer (Highways)
V.Circle, Coimbatore.
The Collector of South Kanara.

Copy of letter No.905 CE dated 27-5-1947 from Superintending Engineer (H) VI Cirlce, Coimbatore, to the Chief Engineer, (H) Madras.

Sub:- W.C. - Fatal accident to cooly, Pakrunnhi Seary - payment of compensation.

Ref:- Your Endt.No.661 D.1.47-2 dated 11-3-1947 and exchange reminders dated 24-4-1947 and 13-5-1947 (enclosed).

I enclose herewith a copy of report No.R.c.5952.A.146 dated 28-4-47 of the Divisional Engineer, Highways, Mangalore along with the 2 forms duly filled in.

The divisional Engineer reports that the work in which the deceased cooly was engaged in entirely a Government work and financed from Government funds and payment made by the Collector on the certificate given by this department. The amount of the bill, for the work executed by the Contractor is only Rs.211/- and the same has been sent to the Collector, South Kanara Dt. for favour of passing, and payment of the same, in favour of the Commissioner for workmen's compensation, Madras. As regards the balance of Rs.509/- (Rs.720 minus Rs.211) towards compensation payable in the case, the Divisional Engineer has addressed the Collector to take necessary action to recover the amount from the party concerned. The result of action will be intimated in due course. It seems to me that in this case the employer is the Collector of South Kanara and not the Chief Engineer.

Copy of No.R.C.5952.A.1.46 dated 28-4-1947 of the Divisional Engineer (Highways) Mangalore.

Sub:- Workmen's comepnsation Act - Accident to Pakrunhi Beary at Jalsur Well Work.

Ref:- Your Nos.1139, ML.13.A dated 4-3-47, 170 ML.A.3 dated 24-3-1947 and 207 ML. dated 13-4-1947.

The two forms received from the Commissioner Workmen's Compensation are herewith enclosed duly filled in. Even though the Contractor was apprised of his liability he has not agreed to sign the two forms. Hence the signature of the employer could not be obtained.

The Commissioner has decided in his letter No.C.L.4556/46 dated 21-3-47 (copy communicated to me in No.207 ML. dated 13-4-1947) that the labourer cannot be excluded from the definition of work-men, hence the full amount of compensation of Rs.720/- as originally intimated has now been noted in the form. The amount of the bill for the work is only Rs.211/- and the same is being sent to the Collector, South Kanara District, Mangalore for favour of passing and payment of the same in favour of the Commissioner. Regarding the balance there is no other amount outstanding in his name and the only course appears to be to take legal action in the matter. The Contractor has completely stopped the work.

Regarding the quarry made in your No.170 ML. dated 24-3-1947 the particulars are furnished below.

(a) This is a work, coming under rural water supply comprehensive scheme for 10 years programme, sanctioned in G.O.No.Ms.23127 PH dated

15.7-40. This was taken up for execution by this department and paid by the Collector from Government funds.

(b) This is entirely a government work and financed from Government funds and payment made by the Collector on the certificate given in this department.

(c) The Contractor is not a registered contractor of this division but work was entrusted to him on the recommendation of the Collector and Tahsildar. As such I am addressing the Collector to take necessary action to recover the balance. He has got no other work in this division.

(d) There is no security deposit to be refunded to him. On enquiry it is learnt that the joint properties of his family are worth more than Rs.10,000/- and if legal steps are taken the balance of compensation can be recovered from the party.

The enclosures received with your [illegible] above No. are resubmitted herewith.

Sd. D.E.(J)
Mangalore.

Copy of Cl.6277/48 dated 20-12-48. from the Commissioner for Workmen's compensation to the Collector ofSouth Kanara, Mangalore.

Sub:- W.C.Act - Cases Nos.293 and 312 of 1948.

Ref: Your letter No.C.6122/47.B. 3 dated 23-11-48 and D.O.Dated 13-12-48.

Please deposit with me at a very early date, the compensation amount of Rs.720/- awarded to the applicant Pakkirunhi Beary in case No. 293 of 1948. You may also call upon the contractor to deposit with you the award of Rs.723/- made in case No.312 of 1948. If he fails to do so, you may apply to me for recovery of the award from him under section 31 of the Workmen's compensation Act. The deposit of the award in the former case should not be hold~~o~~ over till the recovery of the award in the latter.

C.G.Reddi,
Commissioner of Labour.

IN THE COUR OF THE ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONER FOR WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION,MADRAS.

Present: Mr.Henry Peter, B.A., Additional Commissioner for workmen's Compensation.

Station: Camp: Mangalore. Dated 25-9-1948.
Workmen's Compensation Case Nos.293/48 and 312/48.

JUDGEMENT.

This is an application by Isamma Bearthi, the widow of the deceased workman Pakkirumhi Beary, claiming compensation under the workmen's compensation Act, from the Collector of South Kanara. The Collector has filed an application under section 12 (2) of the workmen's compensation Act, claiming that K.Narayana Rai, contracot should indemnify him against any compensation which he may liable to pay in respect of the aforesaid claim. As the two applications for compensation andindemnffication are inseparable I have dealt with the two aspects to-gether.

2. The applicant isamma Bearthi being a purda woman did not appear in cour, but examined three witnesses on her behalf. The facts according to them are: The Collector of South Kanara gave the work of constructing a well under the Rural Water Supply Scheme in Jalsoor village, Puttur taluk to contractor K.Narayana Rai (P.W.I.) the Assistant Engineer Highways and

P.W.2 a maistery under him supervised the work. The contractor executed an agreement, (ex.P.1) before the Collector and according to this agreement he directly employed the coolies and paid them. On the previous day to the accident the contractor called P.W.3 Anthu Peari and Pakkirumhi Beary the deceased workman to go and work in the construction of the well. In persuance of this call P.W.3 and the deceased workman with a few others were working at the work spot on 14-6-1946. Pakkirunhi Beary and three other workmen were at the bottom of the well which was then about 32 feet deep, with an open diameter of 11 feet. The steining wall was just then being constructed with revertments of laterite stones. At about 12 noon on that day a dressed stone which was being let down in a basket, slipped and fell on the head of Pakkirunhi Beary causing injury. There upon he was removed to the hospital and was treated; buton 18-6-1946 he sucumbed to the injury Ex.P.3 dated 16-6-1946 is the report of the accident made by the Supervisor to P.W.1.

3. The Collector while admitting liability to pay compensation of Rs.720/- as fixed by the Commissioner of Workmen's compensation, demanded the contractor to indemnify him. But the contractor disclaimed liability to pay any compensation as the deceased workman was not a permanent cooly working under him. . Ex P.2 is the statement given by the contractor before the Headquarters Deputy Tahsildar Puttur on 10-7-1947.

4. The contractor filed a reply statement stating that he was not a registered contractor and as such he did not come under the perview of the workmen's compensation Act. The deceased worked only for one day i.e. the day of the accident and he was not therefor a permanent cooly. The work under reference was not regular contractor work and the Highways department who were supervising the work cannot divesg themselves of the responsibility for the accidnet. He therefore disclaimed any liability to pay compensation.

The following issues haveto be determined:-

(1) Was the deceased a "Workman" within the meaning of the workmen's compensation Act?

(2) Did the accident as a result of which he died, arise out of and in the course of his employment?

(3) Whether the amount of compensation claimed is due of any part of that amount.

(4) Whether the opposite party is liable to pay any compensation as is due?

(5) Whether the opposite party is entitled to be indemnified under section 12 (2) of theAct. .

IST ISSUE.

5. The Collector was the principal employer and the contractor who had undertaken to execute the well work by an agreement ex P.1 is the direct employer of the deceased workman. Under section 2(i) (n) read with clause XVI of Schedule Ii, the deceased workman was employed in excavating or sinking the well, whose depth from its highest to its lowest point exceeded 20 feet. i.e. 32 feet. Though the workman was employed for only one day yet he was employed for the purpose of the contractor's business which he had undertaken to execute with the Collector. Further under Section 2(i) (n) (ii) "any reference to a workman who had been injured, shall were the workman is dead, include a reference to his dependants or any of them. "In this case as the accident proved fatal it does not exclude the workman's dependants from the provisions of the Act. It does not therefore matter whether the workman worked, only for that day of the accident or whether he was a causal worker.

6. From the evidence of P.W.3 it is clear that the contractor called him and others for work on the previous day to the accident. The contractor has thus entered into contract with the deceased workman to work, though the terms of such contract were not reduced to writing. But the contractor now trots out a case that the deceased workman was casually called in to assist his brother-in-law Mammunji in the well work. The contention is that the

workman was not employed by him. It is against all probabilities that a workman would be called in for a work without the knowledge of the employer (contractor) and asked to work in a well 32 feet deep. But D.W.1 the contractor deposed that the workman was engaged by him directly and that if any hands were necessary he only employed the coolies. When that is the practice it is impossible for Mammunji to have casually entertained the deceased workman. While in the earlier statement E.x P.2 and in the reply statement of the contractor, he admitted that the deceased worked only for one day and that he was not a permanent cooly, in his deposition as D.W.1 he gives a clear go by to these statements and avers that the deceased was never his cooly either on the day of the accident or at any time. He added that the deceased was neither his permanent cooly nor his causal worker at any time. At the same time he admitted that the deceased came for work that day only and that no arrears of pay were due to him. In one of his earlier statement including the counter statement he had ever stated that he had never employed him, and that one of the coolies a lone entertained him with without his knowledge. It is therefore patent that his present defence that the deceased was never a workman under him is an after thought.

7. As it has not been established that the deceased was entertained by one of the coolies without the knowledge of the contractor D.W.1 the ruling cited by the learned council for the contractor in A.I.R. 1936 Rangoon 89/does not apply to this case since the deceased was not a member of a gang working in partnership under a sub-contractor. The contention of the contractor that he was not registered contractor does not also avail for he purposes of the workmen's Compensation Act. It is immeterial whether a contractor or any employer is registered contractor or not! It has thus been established by oral and documentary evidence that the deceased was a workman under section 2 (1) (~~b~~n) read with clauseXVI of schedule 11 of the workmen's compensation Act. ~~I therefore decide this issue in the affirsation Act.~~ I therefore decide this issue in the affirmative.

ISSUE NO.2.

8. The opposite party who is the collector and the contractor cannot contend the fact that the deceased died on account of the accident which arose out of and in the course of his employment. It has been proved beyond doubt that the deceased workman died on account of a stone falling on his head from a height of 32 feet while he was engaged in excavating of slinking the well. I decide this issue also in the affirmative.

ISSUE NO.3.

The widow of the deceased workman Isamma Bearthi has applied for compensation P.W.1 the Assistant Engineer st ted that the wages of the workman was calculated at Rs.22/8 per month. As per Schedule IV, for this wage group, the applicant is entitled to be paid Rs.720/- as compensation under section Act 4(1) a(1) of the Workmen's Compensation Act. No advance or any other amount was paid to the applicant by the opposite party to defrary funeral expenses etc. Hence a sum of Rs.720/- is due to be paid to the applicant as compensation.

ISSUE NO.4.

The Collector being the opposite party admits liability to pay compensation. He has however applied for indemnification by the contractor under section 12(2) of the workmen's compensation Act. The contractor on the other hand states that the deceased workman exposed himself to 'added peril' by going across the bottom of the well when the stone slipped down. According to the contractor there was standing instrnction that when a stone was let down, all the workers should stand close to the wall of the well. But the decease disobeyed this inusturction that and hence he is not liable to pay compensation, or indemnify the collector under section 3(i) b II. But this section does not apply to cases of fatal accidents. Further it is in evidence that the well was of 11 feet open diameter and the revertment was being constructed the resulting diameter and the revertment was being constructed.The resulting diameter at the bottom of the well would being constructed. The resulting diameter at the bottom of the well would therefore be about 8 feet. Within this narrow enclosure four men have to stand. D.W.1 the contractor makes it appear that the stone was let down centrally, and that if the deceased had not crossed it would not have fallen on his head. This explanation is prepostress for it has not been proved beyond doubt that the deceased actually crossed the bed of the well. This in all probability is got up for the occasion..Though the stone was lowered centrally, yet when it once slipped it can never be expected to fall centrally also. It is therefore reasonable to infer that the stone knocked at the sides of the wall and finally fell on the head of the deceased. It is reasonable to expect that within that narrow area with four men working in it, the stone should have hit, if not the deceased, at least any other of the four workmen. It is common knowledge that instead of giving instructions to the workmen to line up along the wall of the well, by way of abundant caution the contractor should have let down such stones before the workmen got into the well. -t is therefor be evident that the contractor has filled to give the necesaary protection to the workmen. I accordingly decide this issue in the affirmative.

ISSUE NO.5

11. It has been proved that the Collector as the principal employer engaged P.W.L the contractor to execute the well work for Rs.2100/- on an agree ment Ex P.1. Under section 12 (2) of the workmen's Compensation Act the opposite party is entitled to be indemnified by the contractor. The fact that D.W.1 was a contractor under the opposite party was not denied. Hence I decide that the opposite party (collector) is entitled to be indemnified to the extent of Rs.1720/- by D.W.1 the contractor,.

Xx In the end I decide that the applicant Isamma Bearthi is entitled to be paid a sum of Rs.720/- as compensation and the Collector who is the opposite party is entitled to be indemnified in a sum of Rs.720/- by D.W.1 the contractor. The contractor will pay cost being Rs.3/- court fee lable affixed by the opposite party to his application.

/ true copy /

FOR JOINT SECRETARY.

CA/28.5.

BY

E.P.H (A1)

Please see the letter from the Bd. of Rev. on pp 1 - 9 cf. This may lie over till 16.6.49 with refce. to 'A' on p 1 ante.

AS
1.6.49

av
16.49

No.T7B PH Gr. 210

Office of the Accountant-General, Madras.

Fort St. George, dated 7th June *194*9.

Enclosures.

FROM

THE ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL,
MADRAS,

ASSISTANT SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
11 JUN 1949
EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT

TO

The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Education and Public Health Deptt.,
Madras.

1554

SIR,

11596/49

Sub:- Workmen's compensation act-South Kanara-Well work Accident to Pakrunhi Beary- Payment of compensation - Head of debit - Board of Revenue's letter Ref. V. 1343/49.2 - Dt. 27-5-49.

--

In inviting a reference to the letter from Board of Revenue mentioned above, I have the honour to state that the expenditure if and when incurred may be debited to "39 P.H.- Post War Reconstruction - Rural Water supply- Estimates of Board of Revenue - Works". The amount when recovered from the contractor may be credited to the same head as recovery of expenditure.

Your's faithfully,

Assistant Accounts Officer.

68 ll
24/6

Edn. & P.H (F1) Dept.

Workmen's Compensation Act – S. Kanara – Puthur tq – Jalroor village – well work – Accident to one Pakrunhi Beary – payment of compensation – Sanctioned

Read the following:

p 3 of

From the Collr. of S. Kanara, Ref. 6122/47.B3 dated 12.3.49.

p 1 of

From the Bd. of Rev. Ref. V.1343/49.2 dated 27.5.49.

p 11 of

From the AG. No. T.7 B. P.H. Gr. 210 dated 7.6.49.

G.O. No. 2285 P.H. dated 24-6-1949.

p 1 of

Sanction is accorded to the payment of a sum of Rs 720/-

(PTO)

(Rupees Seven hundred & ~~sixty~~ twenty only)
to the widow of the deceased, Cooly employed for well work, being
the compensation awarded by the
Commr. of Labour.

2. The lapse should be
of Works – Postwar Reconstruction – Rural Water Supply
debited to "39. P.H. ~~R.W.R~~ – ~~R.W.S~~ –
C. Estimates of Bd. of Rev. – Works".

3. The amount when
recovered ~~from~~ the contractor should
be credited to the same head
as recovery of lapse.

DS
14.6.49
AN
14.6.49

15-6

Note. Finance may see before issue.

DS
14.6.49
AN
14.6.49

15-6

12/1

ASSISTANT SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
799/9
17 JUN 1949
FINANCE DEPARTMENT

P II G
P 324 Budget 1949-50

To
The Collr. of S. Kanara
The Bd. of Rev.
The A.G. thro: Fin.
(Spare copy).

B.P. II wo. 41596/49. 1F18.H.
16.6.49

Fin (Ex. B) Dept

The draft order on pp 1-2 above may be accepted subject to the modification indicated in pencil on para 2 thereof.

20.6.49 20/6/49

20.6.49

E&H.
F1.

U.O.No.
59919 EB/49
20.6.49

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
47290
21 JUN 1949
PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Please see the remarks of the Finance Dept. above. The draft may now issue with the verbal alterations made by Finance Dept

22.6.49.

22.6.49